ALAMEDA COUNTY
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

1333 BROADWAY, SUITE 220 • OAKLAND, CA 94612 • PHONE: (510) 836-2560 • FAX: (510) 836-2185
E-MAIL: mail@accma.ca.gov • WEB SITE: accma.ca.gov

Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan Update
ACTAC Bicycle Plan Update Workshop Agenda
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, 1333 Broadway, Suite 220, Oakland
January 3, 2005, 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. (lunch will be provided)

1. **Introductions & Sign-In** **11:30 a.m.**

2. **Define Bicycle/Transit High Priority Zones*** **Action** **11:35 a.m.**
ACTAC is requested approve the recommended approach for defining priority transit zones. The objective is to improve countywide bicycle access to transit hubs, stations and terminals and promote intermodal connections between bikes, and other transit connections. To do this, the Countywide bicycle network should try to have at least one direct connection to every major transit and hub with a focus on hubs, stations and terminals with that have multiple types of transit or demonstrate high demand for bicycle use. A specific project "Transit Priority Zone Projects" would be included in the Bicycle Plan. The "segment" would be a defined set of improvements at a specific transit, hub, station or terminal or a category of improvement (e.g, bicycle parking) at multiple stations. The "segment" would be subject to the prioritization process for determining which, if any, are on the Financially Constrained or High Priority Project list.

3. **Review of Available Funding Sources Revenues, and Unit Cost Information*** **Discussion** **11:55 a.m.**
ACTAC is requested to approve the attached funding sources, available revenues, and methods for developing project cost estimates for bicycle projects in the Countywide Bicycle Plan. Based on historical revenue projections and what is known about future projections, it is estimated that between $58 and 80 million will be available for countywide bicycle projects over the next 25 years. This is less than what was projected for the 2001 Countywide Bicycle Plan, which was about $80 to $105 million over 20 years, or $5 million per year. ACTAC is also requested to recommend using escalation of the 2001 Countywide Bicycle Plan cost estimates to develop 2005 cost estimates. It is recommended that to calculate the 2005 project cost estimates an escalation factor of 4 percent per year be applied to each project segment for two reasons: 1) cost estimates at the planning level are highly conceptual and 2) the consultants provided very detailed costs for the 2001 Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan. The project cost estimates would be escalated for a five year period, or by 20 percent.

4. **Refine Prioritization Process for High Priority Projects*** **Action** **12:25 p.m.**
ACTAC is requested to provide input on and approve a prioritization process for use in developing a list of high priority projects for the 2005 Update of the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan. It is recommended that the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan

have three levels of investment consistent with the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan: the Vision, the Financially Constrained List of Projects, and the High Priority Projects. Six suggested criteria for selecting High Priority projects are proposed.

5. **Next Meeting**
   February 7, 2005 at 11:30 a.m.

* Indicates there is an attachment for this item.
** Indicates handouts will be distributed at the meeting.

January 3, 2005
Agenda Item 2.0

Memorandum

Date: December 16, 2005

To: ACTAC

From: Beth Walukas, CMA Consultant

Subject: Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan Update – Recommended Definition of Priority Transit Zones

Action Requested
ACTAC is requested approve the recommended approach for defining priority transit zones. Based on discussions with ACTAC and BPAC at their October and November meetings, the objective is to improve countywide bicycle access to transit hubs, stations and terminals and promote intermodal connections between bikes, and other transit connections. To do this, the Countywide bicycle network should try to have at least one direct connection to every major transit and hub with a focus on hubs, stations and terminals with that have multiple types of transit or demonstrate high demand for bicycle use. A specific project "Transit Priority Zone Projects" would be included in the Bicycle Plan. The "segment" would be a defined set of improvements at a specific transit, hub, station or terminal or a category of improvement (e.g, bicycle parking) at multiple stations. The "segment" would be subject to the prioritization process for determining which, if any, are on the Financially Constrained or High Priority Project list.

Next Steps
Develop transit priority zone projects and cost estimates.

Discussion
At their October meeting ACTAC discussed approaches for defining transit priority zones. The 2001 Countywide Bicycle Plan identifies over 30 areas around transit stations and centers where improving bicycle/transit interface and access within the 1-mile zone is a high priority.

One approach ACTAC suggested was to tighten the circles and focus on making sure countywide corridors tie into these more defined transit hubs (e.g., BART, ferries, park and ride lots) at their periphery. Another approach was to move away from the exactness of a one-mile zone and be more flexible about their size because some zones may be more or less than a mile based on connectivity issues and location. Under either approach, ACTAC indicated that the types of projects to be included in a Transit Priority Zone should be well defined (i.e., directional signage to a station, signage within a station area, bicycle parking, and on or off street improvements on routes that directly access the station).

This issue was also discussed by ACTIA's BPAC and they offered the following comments. The one-mile radius was a weak link in the definition of priority transit zones and the emphasis should be on providing access to the hub regardless of its shape. The most important characteristic for determining the size of the hub would be the activity inside the hub in terms of housing density, number and types of transit. The BPAC felt that the countywide bicycle plan should have a high priority to connect to the center of the transit hubs and that multi-modal stations or areas with more types of transit should have priority because it would have the greatest opportunity to increase connections. However, they also felt the opposite could be true, that it could be an opportunity to promote intermodalism at hubs, stations and terminals with not as much choice in transit.

Based on ACTAC and BPAC's comments and a review of access plans and guidelines (e.g., BART Station access studies and safe routes to transit concepts identified in the Safe Route to Schools program), the following approach to defining priority transit zones is recommended.

The objective is to improve countywide bicycle access to transit hubs, stations and terminals and promote intermodal connections between bikes, and other transit connections. To do this, the Countywide bicycle network should try to have at least one direct connection to every major transit and hub. The focus should be to provide direct bicycle links to hubs, stations, and terminals that have multiple types of transit or high demand for bicycle use. The bicycle connection should provide direct access to the periphery of the transit hub, station or terminal or as close as possible. Implementation of improvements within the transit hub, station or terminal would be the responsibility of the transit district similar to the way improvements on jurisdictional roadways are the responsibility of the jurisdictions. Types of projects that would be considered for promoting bicycle access to transit hubs, stations, and terminals and intermodal connections between bikes and other transit connections are:

- Development of on-street bikeways to provide continuous entry to the transit hub, station or terminal.
- Upgrades to streets with existing bikeways to improve bicycle access (i.e., upgrades to rail crossings and street pavement conditions)
- Bicycle parking and storage
- New or retimed traffic signals
- Station pathfinder or wayfinding signs
- Stair channels

In the Bicycle Plan, the "project" listed in the Appendix would be Transit Priority Zone Projects. The "segment" would be a defined set of improvements at a specific transit, hub, station or terminal or a category of improvement (e.g, bicycle parking) at multiple stations. The "segment" would be subject to the prioritization process for determining which, if any, are on the Financially Constrained or High Priority Project list.

January 3, 2005
Agenda Item 3.0

Memorandum

Date: December 16, 2005

To: ACTAC

From: Beth Walukas, CMA Consultant

Subject: Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan Update – Review of Available Funding Sources, Revenue Estimates and Unit Cost Information

Action Requested
ACTAC is requested to approve the attached funding sources, available revenues, and methods for developing project cost estimates for bicycle projects in the Countywide Bicycle Plan. Based on historical revenue projections and what is known about future projections, it is estimated that between $58 and 80 million will be available for countywide bicycle projects over the next 25 years. This is less than what was projected for the 2001 Countywide Bicycle Plan, which was about $80 to $105 million over 20 years, or $5 million per year. ACTAC is also requested to recommend using escalation of the 2001 Countywide Bicycle Plan cost estimates to develop 2005 cost estimates. It is recommended that to calculate the 2005 project cost estimates an escalation factor of 4 percent per year be applied to each project segment for two reasons: 1) cost estimates at the planning level are highly conceptual and 2) the consultants provided very detailed costs for the 2001 Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan. The project cost estimates would be escalated for a five year period, or by 20 percent.

Next Steps
Update cost estimates for bicycle projects and update the fiscally constrained list of projects.

Discussion
Revenue Estimates
The *2005 Regional Transportation Plan – Transportation 2030* identifies a $200 million investment for the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program regionwide. Of this $200 million, Alameda County can expect to receive its proportional share or 21 percent ($42 million), for bicycle and pedestrian projects in Alameda County. In addition, the *2004 Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan* identifies a $200 million investment in bicycle and pedestrian projects in Alameda County between 2005 and 2030. Of the $200 million identified in the Countywide Transportation Plan, $100 million is assumed to be from Measure B. Of the remaining $100 million, funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects would be obtained from TEA-21, TDA, BTA, and TFCA as well as other sources.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of revenues available for bicycle projects in Alameda County for the next 25 years by funding source. Because the investments are for both bicycle and pedestrian projects, assumptions are made about what portion could be expected to be available for bicycle projects on the countywide bicycle network. Based on historical revenue projections and what is known about future projections, it is estimated that between $58 and 80 million will be available for countywide bicycle projects over the next 25 years, or between $2.5 and 3.5 million annually.

This is less than what was projected for the 2001 Countywide Bicycle Plan, which was about $80 to $105 million over 20 years, or $5 million per year.

Project Cost Estimates

The cost estimates in the 2001 Countywide Bicycle Plan were based on detailed cost data provided by the Alameda County Public Works Agency and data compiled from other studies. They represent straight construction costs in Year 2000 dollars plus 30 percent to cover contingencies and design and administration. A comparison on the 2001 Countywide Bicycle Plan cost estimates to other recent plans (i.e., City of Fremont's 2005 Bicycle Master Plan, Contra Costa County's 2003 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan) shows that the estimates used in the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan were equal to or higher as well as more detailed than other bicycle plans. It is recommended that to calculate the 2005 project cost estimates an escalation factor of 4 percent per year be applied to each project segment for two reasons: 1) cost estimates at the planning level are highly conceptual and 2) the consultants provided very detailed costs for the 2001 Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan. The project cost estimates would be escalated for a five year period, or by 20 percent. The 4 percent is based on reviewing California Highway Construction Cost Index and Consumer Price Index data since 2000 and estimating an average that is on the conservative side.

Table 1. Summary of Available Funding Sources for Implementation of Bicycle Projects (FY 2005 – 2030)			
Funding Source	Estimated Total For All Bicycle Projects in Alameda County[1]	Estimated Total for Bicycles on the Countywide Network (25 years)[1]	Annual Bicycle Funding for Countywide Network
RBPP/CMAQ[2]	$21.0 million	$12.0 million	$480,000
Measure B[3]	$50.0 million	$21 million	$840,000
TFCA (Program Manager Funds)[4]	$2.0 to $5.5 million	$2.0 to $5.5 million	$80,000 to $220,000
TFCA (Regional Funds)[5]	$5.0 million	$5.0 million	$200,000
TDA Article 3[6]	$12.5 million	$5.0 to 7.5 million	$400,000 to 625,000
Other Competitive[7] Funds	BTA: $4.5 million TLC: $3.0 – 8.5 million SR2T: $5.5 million	BTA: $4.5 million TLC: $3.0 – 8.5 million SR2T: $5.5 million	$180,000 $120,000 to 340,000 $220,000
Miscellaneous[8] Funds	$0 to $10 million	$0 to $10 million	Up to $400,000
Total	$103.5 – 122.5 million	$58.0 – 80.0 million	$2.5 – 3.5 million

Notes:

1. Estimates rounded to the nearest $500,000.
2. State and Federal funding sources include STP and CMAQ through the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (RBPP) to fund the construction of the Regional Bicycle Network and regionally significant pedestrian projects. Transportation 2030 assumes $200 million is available regionwide in this program. It is assumed that half of that would be available for bicycle projects ($100 million) and that Alameda County could expect to receive its share based on population ($21 million). For bicycle projects on the Alameda Countywide network, the revenue estimate assumes that $1 million over the next 4 years from the Regional Portion and $1 million over the next four years from the County Portion for a total of $2 million would be available for countywide bicycle projects. Because the Bicycle Plan is a 25 year planning document, this funding source or an equivalent is assumed to be available for a total of six four-year funding cycles (24 years) for a total of $12.0 million.
3. The 2004 Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan and MTC's Transportation 2030 identify $100 million in Measure B funds over the next 25 years for bicycle and pedestrian projects in Alameda County. Half of that is assumed to be available for bicycle projects. The revenue estimate above assumes that $21 million would be available for bicycle projects on the Countywide network based on the following assumptions. Half of the 25 percent countywide discretionary funds are assumed to be available for countywide bicycle projects ($11 million). The revenue estimate also acknowledges that historically the jurisdictions have used a portion of their 75 percent Measure B funds for projects on the Countywide network. For these funds it is assumed that 12.5%, or an additional $10 million, could be available for projects on the countywide bicycle network. Projects using Measure B funds can be used for capital projects, programs and planning projects. It should be noted that Measure B funds expire in 2022 and not 2030. For purposes of calculating an annual estimate, 25 years was used.
4. Assumes $1.5 million per year in TFCA Program Manager funds, of which 5 to 15% could go to bicycle projects on the countywide network.
5. Assumes of the $10 million per year available regionwide, Alameda County could expect to compete for $2 million per year or $50 million over the 25 year period. In the 04/05 program, Alameda County projects accounted for $5 million of which about 7 percent were directly related to bicycles. For the purposes of estimating revenues, it is assumed countywide bicycle projects could account for 10 percent of the funds over 25 years.
6. Assumes that $1 million per year for $25 million total is available for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Half of that is assumed to be for bicycle projects in Alameda County and 40 to 60 percent would be available for bicycle projects on the countywide network.
7. BTA: $4.31 million (Table 5.2 Regional Bicycle Plan). TLC: 5 to 15 percent of $56 million (based on continuation of current 3-year program of $7 million or an equivalent and that funds can only be used for bicycle projects that are in Transit Oriented Development zones). Safe Routes to Transit: 12.5% of $44 million (based continuation of the current regionwide 9-year program of approximately $16 million and that Alameda County projects would compete successfully for approximately $5.5 million in bicycle projects).
8. Miscellaneous funds include Safe Routes to School, Recreational Trails Programs, various impact fees or private donations, etc…

Table 2. Comparison of Cost Estimates for Bike Improvements				
Capital Project	**Unit**	**2001 Alameda Countywide Plan**	**2005 Fremont Bicycle Master Plan**	**2003 Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan**
Class 1 – Construct Bike Path	Mile	$500,000	$550,000	$524,000
Class 1 – Improve Existing Path	Mile	$100,000	NA	NA
Class 2 – Bike Lanes - Treatment only (stripe lanes, add signs and pavement legends) - Restripe lanes and bike lane treatment - Remove lane and bike lane treatment	Mile	$20,000 $40,000 $75,000	$30,000	$30,040
Class 3 – Wide Curb Lanes	Mile	$50,000-100,000	$5,000 - $10,000	$18,040
Class 3 – Wide Shoulder	Mile	$180,000		
Class 3 – Residential Street, Local Street or Bicycle Boulevard	Mile	$100,000		
Arterial Improvements	Mile	Up to $200,000	NA	$132,000 (shoulder widening)
Traffic Signal	Each	$155,000	NA	NA
Construct Ped/Bike Overpass	Sq. Ft	$200	NA	$175
Improve freeway interchange to accommodate bicycles	Each	Up to $300,000	NA	NA

This page intentionally left blank.

January 3, 2005
Agenda Item 4.0

Memorandum

Date: December 16, 2005

To: ACTAC

From: Beth Walukas, CMA Consultant

Subject: Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan Update – Recommended Prioritization Process for High Priority Projects

Action Requested
ACTAC is requested to provide input on and approve a prioritization process for use in developing a list of high priority projects for the 2005 Update of the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan. It is recommended that the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan have three levels of investment consistent with the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan: the Vision, the Financially Constrained List of Projects, and the High Priority Projects. Six suggested criteria for selecting High Priority projects are proposed.

Next Steps
Update network to include completed and modified projects. Apply prioritization process to the countywide corridors. Produce a revised financially constrained list of projects with a smaller, draft list of high priority projects for review in February.

Discussion
At the December meeting, ACTAC reviewed a method of determining high priority projects in the 2001 Plan and discussed ways of improving the prioritization process so that the high priority project list promotes a smaller group projects that can be programmed and implemented within a reasonable timeframe. Based on that discussion, a revised prioritization approach is presented below.

The Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan should have three levels of investment consistent with the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan:

1. *The Vision*: The Vision includes the entire Countywide Bicycle network. Currently, that includes about 500 miles of facilities. It is proposed that the Vision element of the Plan be expanded to include two other types of projects/programs that are not necessarily capital related: rehabilitation and maintenance of the existing system and access to transit projects. The Vision would be equivalent to the Big Tent alternative in the Countywide Transportation Plan.

2. *The Financially Constrained List of Projects*: This would represent the list of capital projects, maintenance and rehabilitation projects, and transit access projects that can be

implemented within 25 year planning period *and* is within the estimated revenues available over that period. It is proposed that the Financially Constrained list of projects be based on a skeletal countywide bicycle network that consists of north-south and east-west routes that are the most needed to establish a basic, usable network. A suggested skeletal network that fits within the revenue estimates will be presented at the meeting for discussion. The Financially Constrained list of projects would be equivalent to the Committed and Tier 1 Investment program in the Countywide Plan.

3. *The High Priority Project List of Projects*: It is proposed that the High Priority Projects be selected from the Financially Constrained List of Projects based on the criteria presented below. This list would be equivalent to the Five High Priority Projects currently adopted by the Board and ACTAC that are the focus of funding efforts in the short term. These High Priority Projects would be our focus for implementation over the next 4 to 5 years.

   The suggested criteria for a High Priority project are listed below. It is proposed that some be weighted more heavily than others. These are project readiness, facility is parallel to a congested corridor, and gap closure.

   a. Project must be ready. This includes whether or not it is included on other plans, has demonstrated public support, has completed design plans, has completed environmental documentation, is in an environmentally sensitive area, and can be fully funded.

   b. Facility is parallel to a congested corridor.

   c. Project closes a gap in a route or otherwise eliminates circuitous travel; e.g. bike bridge or connecting path, such as through a park, or provides missing link or an extension of an on-street bikeway, e.g. bike lanes on last section of arterial with otherwise continuous bike lanes.

   d. Project improves a safety problem or obstacle for bicyclists, improves a route with narrow lanes or shoulders, improves a route with high vehicle volumes or high speeds, or reduces accidents.

   e. Project improves routes that directly serve multi-modal or transit stations including BART, Amtrak, Ferry Terminals, major bus hubs or improves infrastructure at multi-modal stations. This will be further defined in the discussion of priority transit zones.

   f. Project improves opportunities for developing overlapping high priority pedestrian or transit projects or improves opportunities for leveraging bicycle and other types of projects.